133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

# PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The Senate will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks, and our guests in the galleries will please rise. Today our prayer will be given by David Schauer, St. Frances Cabrini Church, Springfield, Illinois. Reverend Schauer. THE REVEREND DAVID SCHAUER:

(Prayer by the Reverend David Schauer)

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Reading of the Journal. Senator Geo-Karis.

#### SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, I move that reading and approval of the Journals of Friday, June 10th; Monday, June 13th; and Tuesday, June 14th, in the year 1994, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Geo-Karis moves to postpone the reading and the approval of the Journal, pending the arrival of the printed transcripts. There being no objection, so ordered. House Bills 1st Reading.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 3210, offered by Senator Madigan.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bill.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Topinka, for what purpose do you rise?

# SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I...(microphone malfunction)...and kind of moving around and visiting with you and all others, Easy Bear. He's a polar bear. He's having a hard day today, with ninety-seven degree temperatures. He is from the Brookfield Zoo, and the Brookfield Zoo is having their Day at the Zoo here, at the Capitol. We have

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

over a hundred youngsters over at the Stratton Building who will be there from 10 to 1:30, and they will be making crafts and doing things that involve the zoo and advancing wildlife and natural habitats and all those things. The bear has just taken over. Okay. And anyway, Senators are certainly invited, and you get to know a bit more about the Brookfield Zoo, which is one of the ten most internationally famous zoos in the whole, entire world. It is something we're very proud of in Illinois, and it happens to be in my district. So if any of our Senators would like to have pictures with Easy Bear, he is certainly here, and we will keep him from taking over the Senate very shortly.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Well, thank you, Senator Topinka. That's the shortest bear I've ever met. If I could have your attention for one minute. We're going to do non-concurrences. So if you'll turn to page 9 on today's Calendar, the Order of the Secretary's Desk, Concurrences. The intent of the Chair is to proceed to the Order for the purpose of considering motions to non-concur. Beatty Television has -- and the Illinois Information Service have request permission to videotape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Non-concurrence, on page 9, at the bottom of the page. Senate Bill 230. Senator Farley. Senator Farley. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 357. Senator Dudycz. Senator Dudycz.

Hello...

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Read...

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Amendments 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 357.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Secretary, read -- read the bill.

SECRETARY HARRY:

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Senate Bill 357, with House Amendments 5 and 6.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Senate non-concur with House Amendments No. 5 and 6.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Dudycz moves to non-concur to Senate Amendment -House Amendment 5 and 6 on Senate Bill 357. Any discussion? If
not, all those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed,
Nay. Ayes have it. The motions carries, and the Secretary shall
inform the House. On page 12, about the middle of the page,
Senate Bill 1397. Senator Fawell. Senator Fawell, I see you
hiding back there. Take it out of the record. On the top of page
13, Senate Bill 1570. Senator Topinka.

SECRETARY HARRY:

...(microphone cutoff)...Bill 1570, with House Amendments 1 and 2.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. On Senate Bill 1570, I move to non-concur with House Amendment No. 1, but do concur with House Amendment No. 2. House Amendment No. 1 provides, among other things, that no lease entered into by CMS may require rental payments before occupancy, except under extraordinary circumstances. And under extraordinary circumstances, the lease would be for no longer than one year, and we need to fix that provision in the conference committee.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Yeah. We'll take it out of the record, Senator. It's a split motion, as you know. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1191. Mr. Secretary.

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Bill 1191, with House Amendment 1.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I move to non-concur with House Amendment No. 1 on Senate Bill 1191.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Any discussion? Any discussion? If not, Senator Klemm moves to non-concur on Amendment No. -- House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1191. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries. The Secretary shall -- shall so inform the House. If I could have your attention. It's the intent of the Chair to proceed to the Order of Secretary's Desk, Resolutions, on page 8 on today's Calendar, and run through the resolutions and eventually get to the Compensation Review Board. So everybody better pay attention and get here. Senate Resolution 1282. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 1282 is offered by Senator Watson.

One -- the Committee on Executive adopted Amendment No. 1. There are no Floor amendments.

PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Watson.

#### SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Resolution 1282 does exactly what the Calendar says. It's an agreement that's been worked out between the Department of Mental Health and the impact — or the individuals involved. It tries to establish a system by which those people will be served in the private sector. Right now there's a lawsuit that has been called the Bogart Case, a

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

decision made that requires the Department of Mental Health to identify those people that would need the local community services, and those people, unfortunately, are the ones who are getting it now and not necessarily the private sector ones. This asks the Department to try to review that and do more within the private community. I ask for its adoption.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Are there any questions? Any questions? If not, Senator Watson, to close. All right. Senator Watson moves the adoption of Senate Resolution 1282. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Dudycz, did you wish Senate Resolution 1394 called? Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

## SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 1394, offered by Senators Dudycz and Burzynski.

The Committee on Executive adopted one amendment. There are no Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Dudycz, to explain your resolution.

#### SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. -- thank you, Mr. President. The resolution, as amended, urges Congress to give favorable consideration to five veterans' bills sponsored by U.S. Senator Rockefeller, pending before the -- the U.S. Senate. What it does, it urges congressional approval of the five veterans' bills, in an effort to expedite the claims processes for our nation's veterans. And if there are any questions, I'll be more than happy to entertain them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Is there discussion? Seeing none, Senator Dudycz moves the adoption of Senate Resolution 1394. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Senator O'Malley, on 1470. Mr. Secretary, read the resolution.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 1470, offered by Senator O'Malley.
No committee or Floor amendments, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Malley, to explain the resolution.

### SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Resolution 1470 directs the Senate Revenue Committee to conduct a study of the effectiveness of existing tax credits, exemptions, deductions, and incentives and fees imposed by State agencies. This — this is an outgrowth of the study we conducted pursuant to Senate Resolution 232. I'm pleased to have the support, as a cosponsor of this, the Minority Spokesman for the Revenue Committee, and I also would say that the committee will have the obligation to support <sic> to the full Senate and make recommendations concerning the performance and — effectiveness of specific tax expenditures and agency fees, and concerning what changes, if any, should be made. I'd appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? Senator Palmer.

# SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I stand in support of this, and I am, in fact, a cosponsor of the resolution. It's a logical next step to the work that the Revenue Committee did the last six months. And in fact, I was one of those who suggested that we use the Auditor General's report in 1993 as a basis for doing that kind of analysis. So I would urge that our side support this

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes. I'd like to ask the sponsor a question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates he would yield.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator O'Malley, since we're going to be studying tax credits and exemptions, don't you think it would be a good idea to hold up passing any this year until we have the results of this study?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

That's a very interesting question, Senator Welch. I think it was a rhetorical question, and I appreciate you lightening the load today. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator, do you wish to close? Senator O'Malley moves the adoption of Senate Resolution 1470. All those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The resolution is adopted. Senator Rea, on 1560. Read the resolution... Excuse me. I passed over Senator O'Daniel. On 1486, Senator O'Daniel. Read the resolution, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 1486, offered by Senator O'Daniel.

No committee or Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Daniel.

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

### SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Resolution 1486 encourages development of alternate energy-production facilities for the disposal of solid waste. T&R Development Corporation has proposed to develop a qualified solid waste energy facility in the vicinity of Richland County, which will be fueled by Illinois waste wood and cardboard and nonrecyclable paper. They'll consume some two hundred thousand tons a year. And I'd ask for the adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1486 be adopted. Those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution's adopted. Senator Rea, on 1560. Read the resolution, Mr. Secretary. SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 1560, offered by Senator Rea and others.

No committee or Floor amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Rea, to explain the resolution.

#### SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Resolution 1560 urges the United States Forest Service to transfer the Dixon Springs Agricultural Center to the University of Illinois, according to the 1936 cooperative agreement. There was a special use permit by the University of Illinois for the Dixon Springs Agricultural experimental plot, and there's six thousand acres there. We've made quite an investment over the years, and according to the 1936 cooperative agreement between Dixon Springs' experimental farm and U.S. Forest Service, that this land would be turned over to the Dixon Springs Agricultural Center <sic> upon the completion of a development as a pasture experimental area. And they have been one of the leaders in the no-till crop production, not only in

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Illinois, but in -- in the nation. And this would encourage them to go ahead and -- and fulfill the agreement. I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Rea moves the adoption of Senate Resolution 1560. Those in favor will signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution's adopted. Senator Burzynski, on HJR 86. Read the resolution, Mr. Secretary.

### SECRETARY HARRY:

House Joint Resolution 86, offered by Senator Burzynski.
No committee or Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Burzynski.

#### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Those of you that have been following the POW-MIA question realize that when the Soviet Union broke up, at the time of the Vietnam that we had over twenty-five hundred American servicemen transferred to the Soviet Union for interrogation. Only have quite a few that are half of those came home. Still unaccounted for, including about ninety-six in the State of Illinois alone. These people went forth to serve their country with a commitment, and what we're asking for is a commitment from the country to live up to our responsibility to them. I move for a favorable roll call.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Joint Resolution 86 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none <sic> (1), none

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

voting Present. House Joint Resolution 86 is adopted. Senator Hawkinson, on House Joint Resolution 96. Read the resolution, Mr. Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

House Joint Resolution 96, offered by Senator Hawkinson.

No committee or Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hawkinson.

#### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Joint Resolution 96 requests the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority legislation designed to improve the administration of the juvenile justice system and to report back with those recommendations in -in eighteen months. Senator Stern is a cosponsor of this resolution. Without being lengthy on this, I don't think it's any secret to anybody in Illinois that our juvenile justice system needs reform; that too many delinquents and young criminals know the system backwards and forwards. They know that if they commit a felony, the first couple of times, that nothing is really going to happen to them; that when they're finally brought into the juvenile system, that they may get probation under the juvenile system. And before anything really serious or there are any consequences that occur to a -- to a juvenile offender, they've committed a great number of offenses, and then often they turn seventeen and they start all over again in the adult system. We need to make some reforms so that we get at the problem of juvenile crime at a younger age. This task force is designed to explore different ways of doing that, and I would ask for affirmative vote.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Joint Resolution 96 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 58, the Nays are none. The resolution is adopted. WAND and WJCS <sic> request permission to film. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Senator Jones, did you wish to call... Senator Woodyard, on House Joint Resolution 100. Read the resolution, Mr. Secretary.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

House Joint Resolution 100, offered by Senators Woodyard and O'Daniel.

No committee or Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Woodyard.

### SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This resolution is a result of several of the agricultural groups suggesting both to Representative Woolard in the House and myself, the possibility of constructing -- erecting a statue on the Capitol Complex that would focus and congratulate farmers for their contribution to the entire economy and the industry of the State of Illinois. And that's basically what it does. would be no tax funds involved. It would be all private contributions. As a matter of fact, a sculptor who resides in Illinois has already expressed interest in doing this. He world-renowned sculptor by the name of Marshall Mitchell, from Pleasant Plains, Illinois. And with that, I'd be glad to any questions or urge the adoption of House Joint Resolution 100. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Joint Resolution 100 pass. Those in favor will say Aye. Those opposed will say Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution's adopted. Senator O'Daniel, on House Joint Resolution 124. Read the

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

resolution, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Joint Resolution 124, offered by Senator O'Daniel.

The Committee on Executive adopted one amendment. There are no Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. House Joint Resolution 124, as amended, deals with global climate change and I believe it's very important that the Illinois State Water Survey, a division of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, continue to serve as the State center for scientific research and information related to global climate change and also that the task force report to the General Assembly and the Governor's Science Advisory Committee on its further findings and recommendations by January, 1996. And I'd ask for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 124.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Joint Resolution 124 pass. Those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution's adopted. Senator Topinka. Senator Topinka. Read the resolution, Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

House Joint Resolution -- House Joint Resolution 154, offered by Senator Topinka.

No committee or Floor amendments, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this creates the Medicaid Funding Advisory Committee within the

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Illinois Department of Public Aid. Basically, what this would do would be to meet and take all necessary steps to have the State of Illinois receive the maximum benefits according to the alternative models that are now proposed by the U.S. Government Accounting Office formula for the reimbursement to states for medical services provided under the Medicaid program, adopted through the Medicaid Funding Advisory Committee. Right now Illinois only receives fifty percent reimbursement from the federal government for medical services, which is kind of low for midwestern states, and we are hopeful that this committee would have the wherewithal to be able to lobby Congress and get a better rate for us, so that indeed we do get a more fair distribution of dollars here for Medicaid in the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Joint Resolution 154 pass. Those in favor will -- will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 58, the Nays are none. House Joint Resolution 154 is adopted. Senator O'Malley. Mr. Secretary, will you read Senate Joint Resolution 143.

### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Joint Resolution 143, offered by Senator O'Malley and others.

No committee or Floor amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Malley.

## SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. The U.S. Constitution reserves to the states and to the people all powers not otherwise enumerated and granted to the federal government by the U.S. Constitution. The Tenth Amendment to the U.S.

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Constitution states in particular the following -- the -- quote: delegated to the United States by the "The powers not Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved the States respectively, or to the people." End of quote. We all know here that we hear about State mandates on federal government. Well, many federal mandates are directed in violation of the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. specifically stated in a recent Supreme Court case, and a verv important one for all of us to take note of. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in New York versus the United States, in 1992, Congress may not simply commandeer the legislative and regulatory processes -- processes of the states. This resolution serves as notice and demand to the federal government, as our agent, to cease and desist, effective immediately, mandates that are beyond the scope of its constitutionally delegated powers. I want to share with you some of the comments made by Justice O'Connor the -- the majority opinion in New York versus United writing Where the federal government compels states to regulate, States: accountability of both state and federal officials diminished. Where the federal government directs the states to regulate, it may be state officials who will bear the brunt of public disapproval, while the federal officials who have devised the regulatory program may remain insulated from the -- electoral ramifications of their decision. Accountability diminished when, due to federal coercion, elected state officials cannot regulate in accordance with the views of the local electorate in matters not preempted by -- by federal regulation. I would appreciate any questions, and I'm prepared to respond to any questions there may be about this resolution. But I can to the entire Senate that I consider this very important, not only to our future as a State Body, not only to us as representatives of the people from our districts, but also to the citizens of the

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

entire nation and the legislators that represent them in the various state legislative chambers across this country. Again, I'm open to any questions you may have.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution 143... Excuse me, Senator Welch. I didn't see your light.

#### SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. This argument before this Body is reminiscent of re-creating the Lincoln-Douglas it belongs in that same era, and it should have about as because much effect. It should be relegated to that same era and left on that trash heap. In the State of Illinois, over one hundred years ago Illinois took a stand about state sovereignty, and the legislators in the House and Senate at that time felt so strong that states' rights was put on the ash pile of history, that they put it on the Illinois Flag. And if you looked at the Illinois "State Sovereignty - National Flag today, you'll see a slogan: Union". This Legislature, many years ago, passed a law to take the word sovereignty, put it on the State Flag and put it on upside-down. And if you look at the Illinois Flag today, slogan "State Sovereignty - National Union", the word sovereignty is upside down. And so is this idea. It makes no sense to The State cannot do this. We know that -- what the this. reaction of the federal government would be and that is to cut off money coming to the State, whether it's road money, whether it's health care money. Any funds that they send us, they will cease This is an exercise in futility for a group of sending to us. right-wing, fanatical groups who want to do this, who misread the Constitution and try to bring it down to -- to us to legitimize their right-wing views. All of us should be voting No. This issue was voted on over one hundred years ago, and we should be

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

continuing that same tradition and vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Palmer.

#### SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I want to support what Senator Welch has said. There is a reason that we in 1994 are no having to deal with states' rights issues, and I want to remind you of the tragic and terrible history of this country when we permitted sections of the United States to decide unilaterally who would be a citizen, who would receive benefits, who would even be acknowledged as a human being. We do not need to go backward to that era. I know that Senator O'Malley is merely trying - at least I think that's what he's trying to do - to keep us from unfunded mandates. Let me suggest to you that there are much better ways of doing so. In March, I spent a great deal of in Europe, meeting with those who are putting the European Union together. As messy as that is, as uneven, believe me, the notion behind it is to form a United Europe. Here we are, on the other hand, talking about fragmenting the United States once again. I suggest to you that this is absolutely the wrong way to go, and that we will find ourselves in a very precarious situation in the years to come if this is the direction that we choose to take.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hendon.

# SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates that he would.

### SENATOR HENDON:

Senator O'Malley, is there any possibility that we will lose federal funds, and if so, what fiscal impact would that have on

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

the State of Illinois?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

As a matter of fact, Senator Hendon, the whole focus of this particular resolution is to call on the federal government to recognize that there are state privileges; we are a sovereign State. That doesn't mean that we're independent of the Union, but that if they take money from this State, they ought to send it back to the State. No, under no circumstances is this intended to do anything to prevent dollars to come back. It is to encourage that those dollars come back without any price tags on them whatsoever.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Senator O'Malley, is there any possibility - any possibility - that the State of Illinois will lose out on federal matching funds, and if so, what impact - fiscal impact - would that have on our State, which is currently brinkering <sic> on -- on the edge of the -- of -- of self-destruction right now, fiscally? Is there any possibility at all of that happening?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Malley. Excuse me. Was that a question? Senator O'Malley.

SENATOR O'MALLEY:

I -- I think I understood the question. Senator Hendon, I think you said it again the same way you said it the first time, and my answer would be the same. This resolution is designed and intended to encourage the federal government to send the money back to us without strings.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Senator Hendon.

#### SENATOR HENDON:

Senator O'Malley, would -- would you consider desegregation of -- of schools a -- a mandate from the federal government?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Mallev.

### SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Senator Hendon, I -- I mean, you may be a better expert on this issue than I am, but I believe that this was a declaration originally by the U.S. Supreme Court, and that -- and that they are the decider of the law of the land, and they -- they told us what was appropriate. And -- and I don't know how you feel that impacts on this particular resolution, but as far as I'm concerned, that is the law of the land, and it is to be respected, not only by the Congress, but by the individual states.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hendon.

# SENATOR HENDON:

Well, in -- in conclusion, I would just like to echo what Senator Palmer said a minute ago. Once you get into these individual state rights and get carried away with it, you're going to have a number of states - hopefully not this one - that will begin to rescind the rights of minorities, women, anyone that is not in power. This is very, very dangerous. I don't think that we would allow any of our cities or counties or villages to -- to come down here and do this and -- and, to a certain degree, say that they're not a part of the State of Illinois. And it's wrong for us to say that -- that we can't take any direction from the federal government. I don't -- I don't recall anyone from that side of the aisle putting in this kind of legislation when -- when Ronald Reagan was President or when George Bush was President. So why put it in now that Bill Clinton is President?

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Syverson.

#### SENATOR SYVERSON:

Thank you. To -- first, a point of personal privilege. We're honored to have Senator Lauzen's wife, Sarah, and children over here on this side, or at least -- oop! There are the other two over there. Four of them over there. I think she should be rised <sic> and recognized.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Syverson.

# SENATOR SYVERSON:

Second, to the resolution. Senator Hendon, this is not talking about changing -- changing federal laws that are in place. Our concern - and I certainly rise in support of this - is over the last few years, we have had a serious problem of the federal government coming in and taking over roles that are for They're taking over our school systems; they're taking over our -- our -- our jails. They're coming in and mandating programs that they really have no right to do. The Constitution gives us the ability and separation of powers, and I think many of these federal judges have forgotten that they are federal judges, state judges. Ιf they want to be involved in state not government, let them step down from the federal courts and run for state office. But we need to have a separation of powers, and I strongly support the -- the resolution of Senator O'Malley's.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution 143 pass. Those in favor will say Aye. Those opposed. Excuse me. Did you wish to close, Senator O'Malley? Senator O'Malley.

## SENATOR O'MALLEY:

I appreciate the opportunity to make some closing remarks.

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Senator Welch, there was a similar resolution entered previously, Senate Resolution 1279, which you voted for. So I'm a little bit perplexed by your comments today. Perhaps you've rethought your position. Senator Palmer, I don't consider this fragmenting the State. I actually consider it uniting the State. And, Senator Hendon, again, I believe very strongly that this doesn't do anything but bring money back to the State of Illinois and allows And I us to follow the law of the land, just as well. believe that government which is closest to the people, is the best government possible. My citizens can come -- they can local city councils and village they can come and see their councils. They can easily get to their local school boards. very difficult for them to come down to their state Legislatures, and it's near impossible for any citizen to really reach their government in Washington. So this is an attempt to bring government back as close as possible to the people. I do want to close, however, by quoting - and I wish you would bear with me from a column that recently appeared in the Chicago Tribune. was a guest column by one of Illinois' own - David Broder, a Washington Post columnist, and someone who is not considered a -a conservative, by any stretch of the imagination. But, in part, let me share with you his comments, because I think they say it best: Less attention has been given to the May 16th federal court decision that the key section of the Brady bill - requiring a check of criminal records, drug or mental problems or -- of gun applicants - is a violation of the Constitution and unenforceable anywhere in the country. The law was found to violate one of the most neglected provisions of the Constitution, the Amendment, reserving to the states and the people all powers not assigned to the federal government. Specifically, District Judge Charles Lovell of Missoula, Montana, said that the feds had overreached themselves when they told Ravalli County Sheriff Jay

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Printz he had to divert deputies from their other duties to do gun Organizations background checks buvers. on Montana representing cities and states have been on the warpath all year against the feds' habit of dreaming up new assignments they want the lower levels of government to pay for and carry out. Those unfunded mandates cost billions. Prior Supreme Court rulings on Tenth Amendment cases are anything but simple to reconcile or understand. But -- Judge Lovell found his footing in a 1992 case, where New York successfully challenged a federal law requiring states to dispose of radioactive waste according to --Lovell said his Congress' directive. reading of the 6 to 3 decision in New York versus U.S. led him to conclude background check part of the Brady bill is unconstitutional, "because it substantially commandeers state executive officers and indirectly commandeers the legislative processes of the state to administer a federal program." The principle raised by Judge Lovell is a vital one. As the Judge dryly observed, "The corollary to state and local governments being held financially accountability <sic> for the act is that the federal government will not be... The federal officials will receive some of the accolades or criticism for their program, but they will not suffer any of the consequences for the cost." The underlying issue is very important. Washington spends all its money and borrows, each year, hundreds of billions more. Still, that does not satisfy its appetite for action, so it increasingly has fallen into the habit of mandating other people to carry out and pay for Sometimes the costs fall on both private business and its wishes. The causes are generally good ones, but as the public sector. this decision reminds us, there is a reason why the Constitution limit the reach of federal officials. It's a matter of tried to accountability. Washington, like everyone else, has to learn to pay for its good deeds. Thank you.

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator O'Malley has moved the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 143. There's been a request for a roll call. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 40 Ayes, 15 Nays, none voting Present. The resolution is adopted. Senator Shaw. Senator Burzynski, on SJR 155. Read the resolution, Mr. Secretary.

...(microphone cutoff)...Joint Resolution 155, offered by Senator Burzynski and other Members.

The Committee on Executive adopted one amendment. There are no Floor amendments, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Burzynski.

## SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Joint Resolution rejects in whole the recommendations of the Compensation Review Board. I know that I probably don't need to do this, but let me take just a moment or two to remind you of what's encompassed in this. First of all, a six-percent increase in judicial salaries in both FY'95 and FY'96, in addition to the cost-of-living -- adjustment already in place, raising salaries from eighty-nine thousand to a hundred and three thousand dollars, approximately. Also includes 4.5-percent increase for а constitutional officers, department boards, legislators, commissioners and other authorities in FY'95 and '96, in addition the COLA, raising legislative salaries from thirty-nine thousand to forty-four thousand dollars. The total cost of package for FY'95 alone is estimated at a little over eight million dollars. And I think all of us appreciate the work the Compensation Review Board has done, and they certainly have

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

done a good job of putting their case forward. They've talked a lot about lack of qualified individuals surfacing for these positions, as well as concern for morale of individuals that are serving in those positions as well. I can sympathize with that, but I would also suggest that many of those circumstances centered around that morale and the lack of qualifications also exists with our own constituencies throughout the State of Illinois, and they're faced with that. I'd like to speak just a moment in behalf of those people. While we're debating pay increases, when the State doesn't have a budget completed, we haven't taken care of our Medicaid problem and the action in the House is played over and over in the media like a three-ring circus, I think that Senate Joint Resolution 155 deserves a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? Senator Stern.

SENATOR STERN:

Will the Gentleman yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

He indicates that he would.

### SENATOR STERN:

I heard a rumor, Senator, that the resolution being passed in the House is different in verbiage from the resolution being passed in the Senate. Can you tell me if that's so, and if it is so, if that will make a difference in the outcome?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Burzynski.

# SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

At this point, the resolution in the House certainly is different than the resolution that we have here, and I think that exists primarily in the preamble. That resolution is being held on the Speaker's desk at this time.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Senator Stern.

SENATOR STERN:

Presuming that we pass your resolution here today and that the House passes its differently worded resolution today or next week, or whenever, does that mean, in fact then, that the pay raise has been rejected, or does it mean that because we have done it differently, the pay raise will accrue to each of us here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

It's my understanding that we need to pass the same resolution. It's my understanding that we need to pass the same resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Stern.

SENATOR STERN:

Are there plans in the works to file an identical resolution, either in the House to ours, or in the Senate to theirs?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Burzynski.

SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

After this resolution is passed, it will go to the House for their approval as well. So that's my intent, at this point.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Further discussion? Senator Hendon.

SENATOR HENDON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just think that we should be about attracting more brilliant minds to this Body, and if the salaries are so low to people -- refuse to even come to the Legislature and are better off being a local alderman or something because they make a lot more money, then we're doing ourselves a disservice; we're this State a disservice. We should reject this and -- and

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

be brave enough to accept the compensation that we're all due, because I know most of you work very, very hard, just like I do, for the people of this State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hasara.

#### SENATOR HASARA:

Thank you. Mr. President. I think we're put in kind of an impossible situation whenever we're asked to set our own salary, and I think that really is a very serious problem for us all. "How much is your work worth?" is a question that's difficult for every to answer. This is an issue I think we all I think, respect each other's feelings about, and I certainly recognize that there are some geographic differences, and I respect the comments of my colleagues who come from other parts of the State when they tell me, indeed, there are those differences. But I'm here to represent my own area and my own constituency, and I would like to make just a few points. First of all, we are certainly one of the highest-paid Legislatures in the -- in the whole country. That has been well publicized, and I think point that we need to keep in mind, because our constituents certainly do. Secondly, I thought several years ago when we adopted an automatic cost-of-living increase, it was probably the best move we ever made, because we do make more money every year. Although it's not a lot, it is an increase over what we made the year before, and I really did think it was a perfect solution to the problem of being put in this bind of setting our own salaries. And it is a bind. Lastly, I would like to remind you all that the average family income in Illinois is about fifteen thousand dollars less than the salary of one legislator - not family but one legislator - would be. We are here to be common people and represent the interests of the citizens of Illinois, and making that much more than the average family income in our

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

State is certainly removing us from that role, which I feel is very, very important. I hope you will consider these points that I make this morning and that you will vote Yes on Senate Joint Resolution 155, which rejects the Compensation Review Board report. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Further discussion? Senator Berman.

## SENATOR BERMAN:

President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Thank you, Mr. Senate. I rise in strong opposition to Senate Joint Resolution sponsor mentioned about the Compensation Review Board. 155. I want to read a couple of sentences out of that report, and think it's important to take a historical perspective here. Until the Compensation Review Board was created, pay raises for the Legislature, pay raises for the Judiciary, pay raises for Executive were done behind closed doors, at the eleventh hour on a January, final-days-of-a-legislative-Session kind of procedure. It was embarrassing to those of us who felt that public salaries and that's what subject to public debate, should the Compensation Review Board does. They have held public hearings and they've issued a public report - a report that's been put on every one of our desks and is available to the public. Let me just read a couple of sentences from that report. In regards to the proposed pay raises for the Executive Branch: Now, the Executive Branch means department heads - about a hundred and fifty members of the Executive Branch - whose salaries are set by the They are not part of negotiations Legislature. between the Governor's Office or the executive department and employees. are set by Statute. And unless we provide them with a pay raise, they won't get one. There are many -- quote: "there are departments of State government where staff employees, who receive regular adjustments and step increases, earn a higher salary than

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

there are the director of the department or the agency. Indeed, almost five hundred employees of State government" - five hundred employees of State government - "who earn more than their bosses." That is not good management or good policy. Judiciary: Illinois judges' pay used to be, before 1986, in parity with judges on the federal bench. Those judicial salaries As recently as 1986, again as to the now lag way behind. Judiciary -- Mr. President, if I could just have a little order. recently as 1986, there was only a nineteen-hundred-dollar difference between the salary of a State court judge and judge in the federal system. Today, that salary of a trial difference, Ladies and Gentlemen, is forty-five thousand dollars forty-five thousand dollars between a State judge and a federal A magistrate in the federal system, who is not elected, who does not submit himself or herself to the electorate for their positions, who's appointed and who has a limited jurisdiction for hearing of cases -- a magistrate in the federal system is making almost twenty thousand dollars more - more - than the Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court. That's outrageous. In the testimony in front of the Compensation Review Board, a judge that all of us who practice law have great respect for, a gentleman who served as a trial judge in DuPage County, served on the federal trial bench and was the Chief Judge of the -- of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit - Judge William Bauer - testified that the -- in his view - and he served at the State level and the federal level - in Judge Bauer's view, the work of a State court judge affects more people in their day-to-day lives than does the work of a federal judge. Judge Bauer also said that he worked as hard as a State court judge as he ever did on federal bench. Now you can't ask for more candid comments from an experienced jurist than that. In Illinois, on top of this contribute must outrageous disparity, Illinois judges

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

contribute eleven percent of their salaries to their own pension plan. There is only one other state, in all of the states of nation, that require that kind of a contribution. What we're The asked to vote on today -- or, let me reverse that. proposal of the Compensation Review Board - you know what it amounts to? This year's increase, if it goes into effect, represents four a half million dollars. We are discussing a thirty-billion-dollar Ladies and Gentlemen, we're -- we're discussing here, we're debating here, an amount of money which represents two one percent of our State budget of two one-hundredths of one percent. Now, all of the facts aside, I understand, and we all understand, that this is a tough political vote, but let me make a good political suggestion. I don't think anyone that I have talked to -- and I think I've spoken to almost I didn't everybody on this Floor regarding this issue. hardly anyone who disagreed with the merits of the Executive Branch getting a reasonable pay raise, and most of the people agreed that the judges deserved a reasonable pay increase. problem, politically, is our pay increase, as Senator Hasara Well, let me make a suggestion to you. If, in your heart, you feel that the Executive Branch and the Judicial Branch deserves a pay raise, and for whatever reason - meritorious or political - you feel that you, as an individual, don't deserve or can't take a pay raise, I would suggest that you do what our Governor has done for the past several years. He has rejected his cost-of-living increase. The authorized pay for the Governor about a hundred and four --I'm sorry - a hundred and four in fact, only receives about thousand dollars. The Governor, thousand dollars. He rejects his cost-of-living ninety-eight If you think that, for whatever reason - political or you can't accept the pay raise suggested by the Compensation Review Board, vote No on this resolution or vote

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Present on this resolution, and when the time comes for you to get this raise, reject it, issue your own press release. You will be your own political hero, in a way that a Yes vote will never be able to equal. So I respectfully urge a No vote or a Present vote on this resolution. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.
SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I'm in twenty-second year in the House and Senate, and I can tell you that in all my years, only twice -- once have I ever voted for increase for the legislators and the executives, and that was the cost-of-living increase about two years ago. And I felt it was deserved. This time, I want to support the pay increase for the judges. Unfortunately, ours is tied into it too, but if we very strongly about it, we can always give ours to charity. important thing to me is to have competent judges on the bench. I I'm licensed, have practiced almost fifty-one years. years or better, to practice law in this State. I have practiced before judges who knew nothing and were political hacks, have practiced before judges who were good judges who had trial experience. And lately there have been a lot of people applying for these judgeships, and I don't know that all of them deserve to And the good ones -- a good lawyer can make a good be judges. living. I made a very good living before I came here. I didn't even know what they paid in the Legislature when I first came here, because I thought that I wanted to do something worthwhile, because I owed it to this country, since I was born overseas, and with God's many blessings and the opportunities this country given me, I was rather successful. All I'm saying to you is this: It's important that people be treated fairly and justiciably, and it's important that we have judges who are conscientious, who are

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

able to do a good job, without worrying that they have to get off the bench to make more money practicing law - which they can, if they're competent. And therefore, I feel justified in saying to you today that we should support the pay raise for the judges and for the executives, because when I think of staff people making more, I think -- it's absolutely abominable to me. They don't have the responsibility that we all have. And all I can say to you, much as I like my colleague, I am asking you to vote No on this resolution. I feel that we should have qualified judicial people, particularly. It's important - very important - for people's rights, to have good judges, and I'm not afraid to face my constituency and tell them about my vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator DeAngelis.

# SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I too rise in opposition to this You know, I came down to Springfield in 1979, hoping that I could ensure a better life for my kids, and that I could continue to maintain, for myself, what I had. Well, apparently, I've made a better life for my kids, because I have three boys thirty years younger, graduated from college - not one of them makes less than fifty percent more than what I make. In fact, some of them make considerably more than that. When I came down here, I became acquainted with some of the directors of the I've seen them go. And I have to tell you, various agencies. five times what they they are making two, three, four, When I came down, we got a pay of working for government. Today it's thirty-nine twenty-eight thousand as the base. years, eleven thousand Fifteen thousand. Fifteen years ago. dollars in increases. Fifteen years in which four or five of those had the worst inflation this country has ever known. know - and I've had this argument with constituents - they said, 133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

But I also know "If you don't like the job, leave." That's true. that if I feel I'm right, I ought to vote for something, because There's been talk about judges. that's what my job is. there's fifteen judges waiting to be judges. Well, let me tell you, in Cook County, we have fifteen circuits, and right now on the ballot in Cook County we have fifteen judges judicial candidates - who have deemed to be not qualified. if you want the kind of government that says the only way could come down here is to be an elitist or be supported by a spouse, or if you want to turn around and watch your kids pass you up for the rest of your life, or if you want to have judges in the judiciary system that aren't competent - then you know what I say? - vote Yes for this resolution. But, you know, I spent a couple of years in Texas, and I used to office with a -- a man who was about seventy-four years old. Guy by the name of Rayburn Carroll. He used to walk around with a -- hundred dollar bills pocket, and Rayburn used to always say, "You can't think big if you worry about the gas bill." Не also "Rayburn Carroll never worked for a salary." You know why didn't work for a salary? Because he said the minute you work for a salary, you are telling people this is all you're worth. And I got to tell you, if you vote Yes for this resolution, you're telling people that you're worth no more than what you're making right now. And if that's the way you feel about yourself, vote Yes; but if you don't, vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Cullerton.

### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I heard a story - I'm not sure if it's true or not - but it was about legendary Paul Powell, and they were debating a pay raise over in the House. And I guess it was in the caucus, and he got up and surprised everybody. He said

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

he is against the pay raise. He came out and said he was the pay raise. He said, "If you guys keep on raising your salary, pretty soon somebody good is going to run against you." Now, т know that this is the -- the most troublesome part of this is -is our own salary, but I think it's -- it's worth noting - and was reminded of it when Senator Hasara was speaking - you know, it's not just technically. I mean, this pay raise doesn't any of us, technically. If we choose to not run again, those of us -- or two-thirds of us who are not up for another two years, it doesn't come to us. For those who are running this November, I wish everybody well, but, you know, we could actually lose We don't get the -- the pay raise; it would be our election. opponent that does. I think that's worth noting. But the fact of the matter is, as Senator Berman said, if it's such a political hassle, you can - you're a public figure, you'll have a great press conference and everybody will cover it - you'll The real concern are the people who work for -- in money back. the top level of government. Did you see in the paper when one of the Governor's agency heads took a new job, and he took a pay cut so he could go over to another agency? We've people running billion-dollar mini corporations, if you will, and they've got their top aides who are making more money than them. And in the case of the judges, I have a -- a number of friends of mine who are judges, who are about my age - people I went school with - some of whom are extremely competent judges who sit in the courts in Chicago, chancery courts, where the top cases, the big cases - some of the biggest cases in the country - are argued in front of them, with multimillion-dollar issues at stake, with lawyers who are some of the finest lawyers in the country every one of which -- in fact, the associates who carry the books are making more money than the judges who are deciding the cases. And they know it. And the fact of the matter is that those judges 133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

who are really, really competent - they have offers to leave. They have opportunities to leave and go and make more money, especially when they get to the age when their children start going to -- the expensive high schools and colleges. So I think that we should take into consideration the fact that technically this is not a pay raise for ourselves, and if we do become successful in our elections, we can give it back. The money is needed for the judges who are competent and -- and perhaps especially for the people who are going to serve our State government and make the important decisions that we expect them to make. We want to attract the best to State government, and that's why I think this is a pay raise which is deserved.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Karpiel.

## SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you -- thank -- thank you, Mr. President. going to speak on this, and I'm not going to speak long, except that Senator Cullerton and Senator Berman and everyone have kind talked about the salaries that -- that our judges get and some of our agency directors and our Governor, et cetera. When it -- and I'm not even going to stand here and urge anyone to vote one way or another, because I think this is a very personal vote. Everyone has different districts, different -- you know, ideas on this. But just to remind you of an article that was in the paper - I think last week - and to say that if -- if the Governor of the State of Illinois is making a hundred and four thousand, only taking ninety-eight, if the judges in the circuits -- and I realize in downstate that may be some small circuits, but upstate in our area, some of them are in circuits that roughly -you know, a couple of million people - and they're making - what? - around eighty-nine thousand, ninety-some thousand. Legislators, and in the Senate, we represent - what? - almost two hundred

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

thousand people, and in my area, since it grows every day, it's probably over that by now - we make thirty-nine thousand four hundred and twenty dollars. And the superintendent of a school district in my district, who administers seven small elementary schools, makes a hundred and eighty-eight thousand dollars - the highest paid in the State of Illinois. And I think there's something wrong with the way we reimburse all of our public officials, 'cause something sure is skewed and goofy. A hundred and eighty-eight thousand, not counting the money that he gets extra toward his pension that they give him every year. I'm not going to urge you to vote one way or another, but just to think about how you would like to just administer seven small elementary districts, instead of representing two hundred and some thousand, for a hundred and eighty-eight thousand dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Thomas Dunn.

# SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Well, today is a good day to hide. Today is a good day to sit in your chair and not say anything, because as you can see in the press gallery, they're writing every word. Today is not the day to take the road less traveled. Today is the day to take the safe path. And I must admit to you that I've been the sponsor of a rejection in my earlier years here, and I did it because I thought at the time it And I think that's probably the sponsor's thought today. constituents didn't send me down here to blend in, to hide under my desk or to sit in my chair. They sent me to vote my conscience. And when I think about the judges, the argument correct. And when I think about what Senator DeAngelis said about the people in government, and I think about the people in government that I personally know, and when I think about Dick Luft and the dedication he's exhibited in his new position. And I

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

about Jess McDonald, and I think what a nightmare he's walking into, that he's willing to walk into, to accept. there anyone in this room who would sit in that worth it? Is chair and relive that nightmare day after day? Or Howard Peters, who sits on a time bomb every day, three hundred and sixty-five days a year. Is Howard Peters a slacker? I don't think so. the Department of Conservation - the dedication that I've seen exhibited there. I can go down the list. And we have some truly fine people who work in government. Oh, we've got our ten percent we've got our ten percent here, and ten just like percent in our families, and ten percent everywhere in the world. But that's not who we ought to be concentrating on. We ought to be concentrating on the dedicated people who do serve government, who do work, who could leave and work. What happened to the old philosophy of dedication? I think it's here in many of workers in this State, and I think it's in many of the people in this room. I urge a No vote.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there further discussion? If not, Senator Burzynski, to close.

#### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. There have been a lot of comments that have been made here today that I can't argue - and I'm not going to try and argue those - but I think that we also have to look at some of the other issues that have been involved and that have also been discussed. I kind of feel like the Lone Ranger here today, in the fact that no one has really spoken in opposition to the pay increases, or in support of the resolution itself. But I think we need to take this out of the context of the political arena for just a minute -- with the exception of Senator Hasara. Excuse me. I think we need to take it out of the political arena for just a second and look at it from a different

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

perspective - that of being a business. We talk about -- we give a lot of rhetoric, a lot of lip service to this being a business that we run in the State of Illinois, and that we're here in Springfield to do the people's business, and I'd like to take a business is progressing at this point. look at how our finalized a plan to cover a potential not seven-hundred-million-dollar hole in Medicaid bills. backlog of bills due to vendors who meet the needs of those Medicaid recipients. Our pension system - underfunded. We don't have our budget prepared yet for the end of the year. And the board meetings of our affiliates across the rotunda have been played up considerably in the media as a three-ring circus. And the public is losing confidence in the product which we have, is good government. And finally, we, the board of which directors, are sitting here today talking about giving ourselves and others pay increases. I think that we all came here with a couple of other perspectives in mind as well, and that is that We're here as a service to our we're here as a service. constituents, and we shouldn't stray from that, as well. each and every one of us, honored to be here, and we need to remember that, as well. Do the right thing. Vote Yes.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

The Chair would remind the Membership that a Yes vote on this resolution is a vote to reject the Compensation Review Board report. A No vote on this resolution is a vote to allow the report to become law. The question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution 155 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 28, the Nays are 25, 4 voting Present. The resolution fails. For what purpose does Senator Berman arise?

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

# SENATOR BERMAN:

Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which SJR 155 was rejected.

(Further Comments Inaudible)

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. Motion carries. WCIA-TV requests permission to videotape today's proceedings. Is there leave? Leave is granted. We will return to the -- on page 9 of your Calendar, Secretary's Desk, Concurrence, Senate Bills, and try to move some of these. Senator Farley. For what purpose does Senator Collins arise?

Point of personal privilege, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

State your point.

# SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I've been asked — a point of personal privilege. I've been asked several times by Members on both side of the aisle about these flowers on my desk, and even some asked — had — whether or not — was concerned whether or not I had passed last night, and others wanted to know whether or not it was my birthday. But it's really a gift from last night. I received the Eleanor Roosevelt Award, and today I have some cake. They made a beautiful cake. It's back here, and we're asking — everyone is invited to have a piece of this beautiful cake, from Illinois Central Democratic Women. So the cake is there. Help yourself.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Thank you, Senator Collins. Senator Farley, on Senate Bill 230? Mr. Secretary, read the number and the House amendments. SECRETARY HARRY:

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Senate Bill 230, with House Amendment No. 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Farley. Senator Farley.

SENATOR FARLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

I would move to non-concur in Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 230, and ask for a conference committee to be appointed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there any discussion? If not, Senator Farley moves to non-concur in House Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 230. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The Secretary will so inform the House.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Karpiel, on 630. Mr. Secretary.

SECRETARY HARRY:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 630.

Filed by Senator Karpiel.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

This is final action, Ladies and Gentlemen, so... Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. This is perhaps - and at least I hope - the last in the legislation that we will need for the Kerr-McGee situation in West Chicago. This adds language that is

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

agreed to by the Department of Nuclear Safety, Kerr-McGee, the City of West Chicago, the Attorney General's Office, and everyone involved in this case. I know this is a bad time to call a bill...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Can we give Senator Karpiel our attention, please? SENATOR KARPIEL:

But unless you want the details of it -- what it does, it sets in place the consent decree that has been signed and agreed to by all parties and the Kerr-McGee, and this will allow it to go forward and the trains will start running pretty soon, taking the thorium mill tailings out of West Chicago and into Utah's licensed facility. And I ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 630. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are none. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 630. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Raica on the Floor? May we have leave to return to 1172? Leave is granted. Senator Klemm, on 1200. Madam Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1200.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Klemm.

SENATOR KLEMM:

Well, Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move to concur with Senate -- House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1200. The underlying provision of the bill, as

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

maybe you remember, was to try to assist, on a permissive basis, to help nondedicated roads in certain subdivisions that were established many, many years ago. House Amendment No. 1. which also included those provisions, put a sunset provision of eight years, which met some of the concerns of some of the people in the committee. And House Amendment No. 2 increased the fine from a Class A misdemeanor to a Class B misdemeanor, I believe it is, to -- from a Class B, excuse me, to a Class A misdemeanor if signs have been deliberately removed - traffic control signs. I'd like to add, as I mentioned to the committee, for legislative intent, that one of the amendments does say -- the possession -- knowingly possesses a barrier, traffic control device or sign, would also be And we want to make it clear for the legislative intent quilty. that it would be that those signs would be -- that would have been acquired unlawfully, that had been removed as a safety control device and not one that was purchased lawfully or acquired in a permissible manner. So with that clarification, I do move adoption.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

If not, the question is, shall the there discussion? Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1200. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that guestion, the Ayes are 56, the Nays are none. The Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to bill, having received the required Bill 1200. And the Senate Bill constitutional majority, is declared passed. Madam Secretary, would you read the amendments? Senator Hasara. ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1260.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Hasara.

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

# SENATOR HASARA:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1260. This amendment includes rifle/pistol ranges, licensed shooting preserves and public hunting areas operated by a government entity as sporting activities not governed by noise emission standards by EPA. This was an amendment that came from, and has been approved by, the Sportsmen's Caucus. And I would ask for a favorable vote in concurrence.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1260. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 58, the Nays are none. The Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1200 <sic>. And the bill, having -- excuse me. Amendment 1 to 1260. And the bill, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Woodyard, on 1268 <sic>. Madam Secretary.

# ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 1267.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Senator Woodyard.

# SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I actually have two motions filed, I believe, and I guess my procedure would be to concur in House Amendment No. 4. The underlying bill deals with the Lamb and Wool Association and the Beef Council and their check-off referendums. The -- House Amendment No. 4 is actually the result of -- of audit findings dealing with policies with the Department of Agriculture and -- and the State Fair. And -- be

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

glad to answer any questions on Amendment No. 4, but it's primarily a technical cleanup on audit findings for the State Fair.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment No. 4 to Senate Bill 1267. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 1267. Senator Woodyard.

#### SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank you, Mr. President. Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1267 was at the request of the Illinois Farm Development Authority, and primarily dealt with a lot of clean-up language. Well, in the process of drafting that amendment in the House, some of the references to various Public Acts are in error, and we need to get that to a conference committee and -- and correct those minor technicalities that are in the amendment at this time. So I would move non-concurrence with Amendment No. 1.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Woodyard now moves to non-concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1267. Is there any discussion? All those in favor, say Aye. All those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Butler, on 1302. Madam Secretary.

# ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1302.

Filed by Senator Butler.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Senator Butler.

#### SENATOR BUTLER:

SENATOR STERN:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. We -- this is a motion to concur in Senate Bill 1302, in the Amendment No. 2 -- or, excuse me, No. 1, in particular. The basic bill is that the Des Plaines -- the town of Des Plaines has a TIF district that is finally going to get going, after many years, and so they need to extend the -- their TIF authority for several more years in order to attract the financing necessary. The amendment -- the amendment to the bill is specific to Chicago Ridge, and it changes the date by which sales taxes are collected. These are -- these are specific to these two communities. There's a third community mentioned, but it's unlikely that they will use the -- the change in their sales tax authority. So I would urge approval.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill -- excuse me. Senator Stern, did you have a question?

Yes, Mr. President. I don't know that I feel very strongly about this, but I was the only vote against this amendment in committee yesterday, and I think -- I think it's important to cite the fact that we are creating a precedent here. Here are two communities who passed legislation which permitted them to apply this tax, but they didn't note that the deadline on filing for the tax occurred after they wanted it to. So we are making an exception so that they can impose this tax for the Christmas season of sales this year. You know, it's not an atrocious thing to do, but I think we should recognize that we are creating a precedent and possibly opening a Pandora's box. Thank you.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WEAVER)

Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Senate concur with House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1302. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 52, the Nays are 2, 2 voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendments -- No. 1 to Senate Bill 1302. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Palmer, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR PALMER:

Point of personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

State your point, Senator Palmer.

# SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd like to introduce in the Democratic side of the gallery behind us, two representatives from Teacher's Pet Child Care here in Springfield: Judy DeSilva, the Director, pre-kindergarten teacher; and Nancy Pressler, who's the Assistant Director, and teaches the three- and four-year-olds. You -- many of you may know that I have my eighteen-month-old granddaughter down here with me this Session, and this is my way of not only saying thank you personally, but recognizing a facility that, next to the child care facility operated by St. John's Hospital, is the only other facility in Springfield which is licensed twenty-four hours a day to meet the needs of working parents and particularly, in my case at this moment, a single grandparent with an infant. So I wish you would welcome them to the Senate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Will our guests please rise, and welcome to Springfield. Keep up the good work. Senator Raica, for what purpose do you rise?
SENATOR RAICA:

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Mr. President, first of all, I'd like to apologize. I was called over to the Civil Service Commission to testify on an individual from my district, but if -- at the pleasure of the Chair, I would just ask leave to go back to 1172, at the pleasure of the Chair, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Yes. We have other requests, and when we complete this order of business, we will go back to -- to that particular bill. Thank you. We are on page 11 of the Calendar, and on the Order of Concurrence is Senate Bill 1324. Senator DeAngelis. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1324.

Filed by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1324, when it left the Senate with a 58 to nothing vote, had two parts: one, it permitted the State Board of Education by electronic transfer to make school aid and other categorical grant payments directly to schools; and secondly, created the Financially Distressed School District Act. When it went over to the House, the House put on an amendment which I can best describe as technical, because it took care of some of the concerns of the regional superintendents regarding the direct transfer of these funds because they felt, in some instances, they needed some oversights for schools who might not be doing things properly. Be happy to answer any questions. If not, I move that we concur with House Amendment No. 1 on Senate Bill 1324.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? This is final action. Seeing none, Senator DeAngelis -- the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments - No. 1 to Senate Bill 1324. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 58, there's no voting No, no voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 1 to Senate Bill 1324. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Calendar, Order of Concurrence, Senate Bill 1326. Senator Karpiel. Senator Karpiel. 1328. Senate Bill 1328. Senator Peterson. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 1328.

Filed by Senator Peterson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Peterson.

#### SENATOR PETERSON:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. The bill, as it left the Senate, basically stays intact. There were two House amendments, both dealing with the City of Chicago regarding entities wishing to appeal a decision of the local liquor control commissioner. Also, the amendment would allow clerks of the cities to accept any petition to place the question on the ballot for the precinct if, in fact, they wanted to vote the precinct dry if an invalid petition had previously been filed. And it also focuses on petitions previously discussed in Amendment 5, from the licensed establishment to the actual street address. I move for concurrence to both -- House Amendment 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 1328.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Any discussion? Senator Sieben.

#### SENATOR SIEBEN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. rise in support of the Gentleman's motion. When this bill originally passed out of the Senate, there was concern by Members that there might be jeopardy here for parents who want to serve some alcohol to their underage children in their home. -- under Amendment No. 5, that protection is granted to those parents who want to supervise the consumption of alcohol by their own children in their own home. But this legislation, then, is not intended to target religious ceremonies or special occasions when parents allow their children to have a glass of wine or champagne. What it really does is address those beer parties at which teenagers drink illegally with the knowledge and permission of adults. And I believe those adults who provide alcohol these minors are breaking the law, and must be held accountable. Too many teenagers each year are killed in traffic accidents where alcohol is a contributing factor, and I would urge everyone vote Yes for this important legislation. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Any further discussion? Senator Peterson, to close. SENATOR PETERSON:

I ask for a -- I ask for a favorable roll call on the concurrence of the Amendments 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 1328.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

This is final action, and the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 5 and 6 to Senate Bill 1328. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. Senate Bill 1328, having —the Senate now concurs in House Amendments 5 and 6 to Senate Bill

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

1328. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the bottom of page 11 is Senate Bill... Excuse me. We are now on page 12, and we have Senate Bill 1336, Senator DeAngelis, on the Order of Concurrence. Senator DeAngelis? Senate Bill 1336. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

#### ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House -- I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1336.

Filed by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator DeAngelis.

#### SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1336, when it left this Body, allowed the taxpayers of Cook County to go to the Property Tax Appeal Board and also removed constructive fraud as the ruling evidence in trying to protest your property tax bill at its highest level. The House, surprisingly enough, picked up the call, and I have to tell you, I want to thank Senator Berman - I want to thank Senator Berman - I want to thank Senator Berman - who is prepared to explain the action that the House did, which moved us, as described by one of the witnesses, light-years ahead in the property tax appeal process. Senator Berman, I'd like to have you...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Berman, to explain the House.

# SENATOR BERMAN:

I give up. Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1336 lessens the burden of proof in any circuit court objection proceeding filed by a taxpayer after contesting an assessment before either a county board of appeals or a county board of review. Outside of Cook County, this will have little effect,

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

since most taxpayers will continue to pursue relief after the Board of Review at the State of Illinois Property Tax Appeal Board level. For Cook County taxpayers, the currently onerous constructive fraud doctrine would be modified by eliminating the requirement, as stated in the Ford Motor case, that the taxpayer must prove the -- quote, "the assessment was not made in the exercise of honest judgment", unquote. By eliminating this requirement and specifically overruling the Ford case, which this bill now does, the legislation repeals the quote, "dishonest judgment", unquote, part of the constructive fraud doctrine stated in the Ford Motor case. And that's as close to an explanation of the House as I can get.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator DeAngelis, do you wish to close? Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Only to move to concur with House Amendments 1 and 2. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

This is final action, and the question shall -- before the Senate, is that we shall concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1336. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 56 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1336. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. The middle of page 12. Senate Bill 1357. Senator Hawkinson. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

# ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 7 to Senate Bill 1357.

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Offered by Senator Hawkinson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hawkinson.

#### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. We have all too often been witness in this State to tragic deaths of children by child abusers. After last year's particularly tragic instance involving the hanging of three-year-old Joseph Wallace, there were several task forces that went to work on recommendations to change the way that the juvenile court system deals with neglect and abuse cases, to try and find a way to provide that -- that never again would a juvenile court judge, who's making this kind of tough decision, be deprived of information that exists within the State system, whether it be the criminal justice system or others, so that the judge will have all information available to her or him to make this kind of tough decision, whether or not to return a child to an abusive home. Those task forces went to work and they issued Some months ago, Chief Judge Comerford called their reports. together a council of the Governor, the President of the Cook County Board and the four Legislative Leaders. Each of those persons designated a representative, and I was pledged to -pleased to serve on that council, along with Senator Dunn. We have been meeting regularly over the course of the year. We have reviewed the recommendations of all of these task force. We held meetings. We have put out these recommendations for review by all the interested parties in the juvenile court system, the amendments of -- House Amendments 1 and 7 to Senate Bill 1357 are, in part, the products of that study. I believe that they are all noncontroversial, save one. And I'm going to give you a brief explanation of -- of what they do and where they come from. First of all, in House Amendment 1, there's a recommendation from the Illinois Child Fatality Task Force that creates the Child Death

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Review Team Act so that there will be quick and prompt review of suspicious child deaths so that we can get the facts out and try and make sure that they're not repeated. There's a recommendation of the Illinois Family Preservation Task Force, the Child Fatality Task Force, and the Illinois Child Welfare Action Group that requires that DCFS have access to services necessary to meet the assessed needs of its clients; requires that DCFS develop, by July 1, 1995, the following: a standardized child endangerment assessment protocol, related training procedures, a standardized method for demonstration of proficiency in application of and an evaluation on reliability of the protocol. Now what does all that language mean? What that language means is that there are points throughout the system where decisions have to be made. We want to make sure that the people who are required to make those decisions within DCFS have the training and have standard set that they will go by, so that we get consistent decision making and so that each of these decision makers has access to information which will enable them to make the decision for the best interest of the child. The provision in House 1 that has generated some controversy is that Amendment No. provision that has already been passed by this Body earlier, by 58 to nothing - every one of you voted for it - was Senator Jones' provision on the Healthy Family initiatives. voted for it 58 to nothing. There are some who are -- who fear that the Healthy Family initiatives, as adopted in some states, bring government intrusion into families. Let me tell you what this does. The language on Healthy Families does not any healthy families program in any other state. It has two one, that any plan that is adopted must requirements: voluntary - there can be no home visits that are not voluntary; secondly, this bill doesn't create the program. This bill only creates a steering committee, which will be appointed by the

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Executive Branch, and I have assurances from the Senate President, well as the Governor's Office, that there will be appointed to this steering committee people who share the concerns about this program, who share the values we all do about keeping government out of families where it's not necessary. What this program -this plan ought to be directed to is it ought to be directed to those dysfunctional, high-risk families that exist too often in State, where we have perhaps a -- a teenage mother who's had no training in parenting, knows nothing about parenting, family support, to offer services on a voluntary basis to improve the quality of parenting skills. But again, Ι This portion that you may have received some calls about does not establish any program. It only establishes steering committee, and I have assurances from the Governor's Office, as well as the Senate President, that this will be And based on those recommendations and representative group. those assurances, those in committee yesterday who had concern, voted for the bill - it passed 9 to nothing - and those who have been calling you and were present at committee yesterday, did not sign in in committee in opposition to these motions to concur. the calls, I think, were generated before that action yesterday in committee, and no one signed in in opposition in committee, despite the fact that they were present yesterday, based on those kinds of assurances. Amendment No. 7 is an extremely important amendment because it gets to the information-sharing stage. requires DCFS to enter into interagency agreements for information with the Secretary of State and the Illinois Department of vice versa, to make sure that criminal history is available in the information and others that available to the court when they're making these tough decisions. This is an important bill. It is important bill because we need to address the inadequacies in our juvenile court system that too

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

often permit tragic deaths, to our kids, to occur. No system will ever be foolproof. No matter what safeguards we put in, child abuse, unfortunately, will continue, but where we can prevent it with a flow of information and with access to services on a voluntary basis, we ought to do so. And therefore, I ask your concurrence in House Amendments No. 1 and No. 7 to Senate Bill 1357.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

#### SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I had the privilege of serving on the Child Fatality Task Force, and as Senator Hawkinson said, we have met several times. One of the persons also on that task force, for the information of his former colleagues, was former Senator and former President, Phil Rock. During that task force deliberations, we were given reams and reams of materials and case histories of what is going on with some of our children in this State, both downstate and in the metropolitan areas. Something has to be done. We are finding children abandoned in We are finding children whose parents are nothing but children themselves, and who are addicted to drugs, and whose grandparents are addicted to drugs. Our children are not only This is an excellent bill. being hurt, but are being killed. This is a bipartisan bill. This is a bill that everyone has worked on, including judges, DCFS workers, coroners, legislators, lay people, social workers, social agencies. It is the best bill that we could come out with, and it certainly deserves everyone's support. And I ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

# SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. -- Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

think this bill is -- is a very good bill. It has voluntary help in it. And let's not kid ourselves. The children at DCFS are either children who have no parents, or have parents who don't care or parents who don't know how to care for their children. And I think if we put this bill in -- in motion, I think we'll be doing -- we'll be taking a step in the right direction. These children are helpless. They look to who for help? If we don't help them with some good legislation, who's going to do it? I certainly support this concurrence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Cronin.

# SENATOR CRONIN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senator Hawkinson alluded to it, or spoke to it, in his remarks. There have been some concerns raised about this legislation, specifically regarding the issue of privacy and an intrusion into private decision-making among parents about how to raise their I think, though, that we must bear in mind that the goal of this legislation - the objective of this legislation to prevent child abuse. Child abuse is a very real problem, and we must address this problem. In order to prevent child abuse, if you think about it, we have to identify those people who may be likely to commit child abuse. And so for purposes of legislative intent, we must realize that in this legislation, there will objective standards developed by an authorized committee as to what constitutes risk factors - factors like a history of abuse among the parents, a history of prior criminal activity. Those are the objective standards that will be relevant considering whether or not parents are likely to commit abuse. Then - then - when these individuals are identified, then there is an offer made to them of assistance. The party that is identified as a high risk may or may not accept that offer of assistance.

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

It's a voluntary, decision-making process. There's a delicate line here to walk. The General Assembly will be watching this very carefully. But I think this is a very, very needed piece of legislation, and I urge an enthusiastic Yes vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Lauzen.

#### SENATOR LAUZEN:

Thank you, Mr. President. First of all, Senator Hawkinson, I'm not opposed to the majority of your bill. There's certainly much more good in this bill than there is anything to object to. the concept is good. I think it's naturally think that well-intentioned, and I applaud your work, and I also respect the judgment of -- of our colleagues who listened to the testimony vesterday in that committee meeting. And there's certainly no one in this Chamber who wants a child harmed, much less killed, by So I think that our hearts are together on what we want to accomplish here. However, this bill may go too far in certain and may further shift the balance between big government and families. As a side note, I would encourage those groups that organize the calls that end up in -- on all of our desks and return those calls, that if they're not going to come forward to testify in those committee meetings, that perhaps shouldn't start the objection if they're not going to come and testify to have their point of view heard and put into the portion of the debate. I have four basic concerns with the Section around Healthy -- the Healthy Families program. Number one, we already spend more than seven hundred and fifty million dollars to protect all children in Illinois in the Department of Children and Family Sometimes State government reminds me multiheaded-hedra, where you lop off one area, or one head, and two grows back. Here we have now another agency that is going to attend to trying to protect our children. I would think that

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

there's already enough confusion and enough of a challenge and enough duplication without adding another player, in the Department of Public Health, to what's already too complicated. I'm also under the impression that -- that this bill -- one of the Sections of this bill would exempt members of the task force studying the problems from Freedom of Information Act. I've only been here two Sessions, but I've already done more casework with DCFS than I would want to, and I -- I have already found that it's too hard to wrestle information out of DCFS, and I've already found, as you have probably already found, that these cases are used in -- these -- the accusations are used in custody cases and And I don't think that that's what we mean to be divorce cases. using our State agencies to do. I understand that we're also going to be exempting these folks from Open Meetings Act, and I quess that I would encourage, as the steering committee is putting together the intention of what we want to do, that -- that we don't give them the extraordinary powers that could be even worse abused. Also, I understand that this Section of this provide for tort immunity and indemnification. We are giving extraordinary powers, if the steering committee adopts those types of roles. I guess that, in today's debate, I would encourage who's ever selected in those -- to be on that steering committee, as they're going through their work, to not put into the hands of State agencies additional power that is not balanced by -- by the responsibilities. I appreciate the opportunity to put in these -these concerns, and again, I appreciate Senator Hawkinson's dedication to the concern. I think that we all join him in wanting to end child abuse.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Klemm.

# SENATOR KLEMM:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. I guess I have a -- I don't

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

know if it's a question or not, to the sponsor. It's -- it's point I'll make and perhaps he could respond to it. And I understand that other -- under present law, unfounded reports are expunged from a person's record, and yet this would then keep an unfounded report in the central registry, I understand, for perpetuity, I guess. And part of the Section, I see that the automated information system, probably which had been, I guess, prohibited from placing information in that automated system, is Senator maybe being changed in some way, and perhaps could explain that. And I was wondering that if you have an unfounded report, that that would never be off that person's give you two examples why I bring that to record. Now let me attention. One, I had a constituent who had a problem and was found innocent, and the family went through a very, very traumatic And I guess if you have never gone through that experience. before, you don't know how it can tear a family apart. just recently, we had some young students who paid a dollar to make an accusation against a schoolteacher. Now, that was a very serious charge, and that charge became to the point where the school board took that student -- or, that teacher away from teaching; found out that it was a sham, a hoax. And yet it was serious enough that it was an unfounded report. My concern is for that schoolteacher, in this case, a -- and also particular constituent of mine, and others, perhaps, who were found to innocent, that the charges were unfounded, and yet that totally report - it appears from what I'm able to read here continue to follow that family or that person, would continue to be now in an automated system, could be called upon, perhaps don't know if this is correct or not - could be called upon on -on other court cases that may prejudice something. And I just need, I think, the sponsor's clarification, because that would be a little bit of extreme in this case. And I would perhaps ask if

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

he could answer that in his closing, or whatever you do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Well, there is no further discussion. So, Senator Hawkinson, to close, and you can respond.

#### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I will respond first to that. First of all, that provision is not in the objected-to part of the bill, and the groups who are opposed to this bill support that provision. Reverend Vanden Bosch and others who I have spoken to support that part of the bill. That's not in the Healthy Families the bill. The reason they support it is, the provision you're referring to does absolutely nothing to increase mandated reporting, increase accusations, as you call them - has nothing to What it says is, where there are prior reports, do with that. these will be kept in the registry, yes, but it's not on a record. It is confidential information. Can't be released to anybody. As a matter of fact, it's a crime, under the provisions, to disclose information outside the system. So -- and the -the schoolchildren example, which we all agree is horrible, even be kept under this, because schoolchildren are not mandated We're talking about mandated reporter unfounded reporters. reports. So it doesn't address in any way unfounded accusations. And in terms of increasing them or anything, it says where you've got serious injury and you've had one instance and DCF looks --DCFS looks at it and they say, "We don't think this is a founded report. We don't think there was abuse here." But if a year from now or six months from now that same thing happens and happens a third time, "you know, maybe we were wrong". And by keeping it in this confidential file, they'll have access to that. It won't be But it doesn't follow anybody. It doesn't go into circuit court. No. The question was that these follow their way into divorce proceedings. Well, unfortunately, they do. And I

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

think sometimes unfair accusations, and hateful and spiteful accusations, get made in other forums. But this has nothing to do with that, because these records aren't going to be available. Now, if the parties are the same and they're the persons who made the accusations, sure, they can make it again in another forum, but this bill has nothing to do with that. The only area of bill that has had any group object is the one I referred to earlier, which I again reiterate, you all voted for once - 58 to And I think the reason you did, and the reason that there was no objection in committee yesterday, is that this been misunderstood as the adoption of a plan that's in existence in Hawaii or somewhere else. It isn't. It is the forming of a steering committee to come up with a plan. To get back to the bill as a whole, don't forget the problems that we've had, the tragedies we have had, in part because we have not had criminal history information or other information available to a court judge. And if that information had been available, we might saved some kids. The decisions might have been different. This has been the product not just of this task force that Senator Dunn and I were on. We didn't go out and seek a new product. looked at all the studies by the professionals, by those who studied the tragedies, who made their recommendations of all these groups. We picked the best of them. We think they're contained in Amendments No. 1 and 7 to Senate Bill 1357. And for the kids of Illinois, I'd ask for your Aye vote.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The Senator was closing, and this is final action. And the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 1 and 7 to Senate Bill 1357. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 52 voting Yes, 3 voting No, 3 voting Present.

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

The Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 7 to Senate Bill 1357. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. In the middle of page 12 is Senate Bill 1448. Senator O'Malley. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

#### ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1448.

Offered by Senator O'Malley.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator O'Malley.

#### SENATOR O'MALLEY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1448, which I am moving to concur with, amends the Uniform Partnership Act. It provides that a partner may register with the Secretary of State as a registered liability partnership; requires renewal annually; limited provides that a partner is <sic> a registered limited liability partnership is not liable for certain partnership debts, liabilities or obligations; amends the State Finance Act to Division of Corporations Registered Limited establish the Liability Partnership Fund. Moneys in the Fund are to be used to administer the Division of Corporation's duties under the Uniform Partnership Act. I request a favorable roll call.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none -- this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 1448. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No.

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

1 to Senate Bill 1448. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1479. Senator Madigan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1558. Senator Garcia. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 6 to Senate Bill 1558.

Filed by Senator Garcia.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill, as amended, amends the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practice Act. It allows the Attorney General to set the maximum fees that may be charged for immigration services in Illinois. It prohibits anyone from charging fees for referring a person to an attorney or any immigration matter covered under the Act. Requires the Attorney General to promulgate rules to administer and enforce the Act by January 1st of 1995.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Senator

SENATOR FAWELL:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Sponsor will yield, Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Garcia.

SENATOR GARCIA:

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

The bill exempts attorneys.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any other discussion? Senator Garcia, would you like to close?

SENATOR GARCIA:

Would urge a favorable vote. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

This is -- this is final action. And the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 6 to Senate Bill 1558. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 6 to Senate Bill 1558. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Jacobs, for what purpose do you rise? SENATOR JACOBS:

Yeah. Just a point of inquiry. In that last bill, that was a Democrat sponsor. Was that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

The last time that I knew, yes.

SENATOR JACOBS:

I -- I'm just curious how it got there. That's okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Oh, I appreciate you bringing that to our attention. Senator Hall, do you wish -- do you want to call your bill? Senate Bill 1620. Senator Fitzgerald. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 5 to Senate Bill 1620.

Offered by Senator Fitzgerald.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Senator Fitzgerald.

#### SENATOR FITZGERALD:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This is a motion to concur in House Amendment No. 5 to Senate Bill 1620. House Amendment No. 5 provides that if a special event retailer purchases less than five hundred dollars of liquor for an -- for an event, the special event retailer may purchase the liquor from a retailer, rather than from a distributor. requires a beer distributor or importing distributor to use its best efforts to make each of its brands of beer available for sale to retail licensee. It only applies to beer, and does not apply to spirits or wine. Beer has been treated differently under the Liquor Control Act, because, like other malt beverages, it loses quality after a short period of time and is, in effect, a perishable product. In addition, beer is governed by the Industry Fair Dealing Act, which establishes exclusive sales territories for the distribution of beer. This continues to ensure that retail licensees continue to have the opportunity to purchase beer and beer products. opposition to this amendment. I urge a favorable vote.

#### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Senator Fitzgerald, do you wish to close? This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments No. 3 -- No. 5 - I beg your pardon House Amendment No. 5 to Senate Bill 1620. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments No. 5 to Senate Bill 1620. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator DeAngelis,

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

on Senate Bill 1691. Madam Secretary, please read the bill. ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1691.

Offered by Senator DeAngelis.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator DeAngelis.

#### SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1691, when it left the Senate, did two things: One, it extended the R & D tax, removed the sunset; and secondly, dealt with the issue of international flights buying domestic fuel. The House chose to put two amendments on - Amendments No. 1 and 2 - and both of them had passed the Senate previously. One is a cleanup of 522 -- Senate Bill 522, and the other one is a clarification on the sales tax exemption on leased equipment. So, be happy to answer any questions. If not, I ask that we concur with those two amendments.

# PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, this is final action. And the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1691. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1691. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We are now on page 14, and Senate Bill 1730. Senator Hawkinson. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

# ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1730.

Offered by Senator Hawkinson.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Hawkinson.

#### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to concur in House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1730. This bill is the State's zero-tolerance bill for drivers Secretary of twenty-one years of age. The House, I believe, has improved the bill with -- with House Amendment No. 3. It was amendment between the Secretary of State's Office, working with Representative Homer. It provides that blood or breath tests for persons under twenty-one shall be admissible only in actions or proceedings directly related to the incident upon which the test It sets up the standards for review of a requested was made. suspension and the issues that will be reviewed during the suspension, and I believe more adequately sets out those standards than we did in the original bill. It more clearly exempts individuals who consumed alcohol in the performance of a religious ceremony or the ingestion of medicine at recommended dosages. Amendment No. 4 attempts to correct a problem that has happened in the Rock Island area, involving car dealers from out of state coming in and displaying automobiles at the -- the airport in -in Moline. This proposal comes as an agreement between the -- the car dealers and the Secretary of State's Office to clarify definitions of display and -- and advertising. We are going need a trailer bill to clean up the language in -- in that amendment. The original bill 1730 - it passed this Body think it's improved now, with the cooperation of the Secretary of State and Representative Homer, in terms of procedure and the application of the setting up the review Illinois Administrative Review Act and possible circuit court

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

review. And I would again ask for concurrence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, rise in strong support of Senate Bill 1730. Whenever this bill originally come around, I was one of those who believed that we already had legislation on the books that could handle this, because minors weren't allowed to drink alcoholic beverages anyway, and the bills we have floating around were not in the best shape. I think this bill has been put into very good shape, and it now becomes a much better bill. And I ask for support on this side of the aisle.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there further discussion? Further discussion? Senator Hawkinson, to close. This is final action. And the question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1730. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yes, no voting no, no voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1730. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Still on the page 14, Senate Bill 1766, Senator Donahue, on the Order of Non-concurrence. And we have Senate Bill 1766. Madam Secretary, would you please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1766.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. I would move to

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

non-concur. Is it Amendments No. 1, 2 and 3? Those are... In the Calendar it says Senate amendments. I'm -- I want to non-concur in the House amendment. I don't know what the number is. 1, 2 and 3. I would like -- I would move to non-concur in Amendments 1, 2 and 3.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Donahue, those are House amendments. And the Senator moves to non-concur in House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1766. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. And the Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Raica. We were granted -- earlier we granted leave to Senator Raica to return to this order of business. And that is on page 10, and it is Senate Bill 1172. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

#### ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment No. 6 to Senate Bill 1172.

Offered by Senator Raica.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Raica.

# SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President for coming to this order of business. What Amendment No. 6 does is basically it is agreed-to language by all parties - the Senate, the House and the utilities, in addition to CUB - which would allow for refunds being paid to current Edison customers who have refunds coming to them. That's all the bill does. And I would like to thank staff on both sides for -- for their many hours of hard work in putting this together with the agreed-to language. And I am just asking for concurrence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion? Any discussion? This is final action, and the question is, shall the Senate concur in House

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 1172. Those in favor, vote Aye. Opposed, vote No. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Yes, no voting No, no voting Present. The Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 6 to Senate Bill 1172, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Shadid, on Senate Bill 1232, again on page 10. Senator Shadid wishes to non-concur. Madam Secretary, please read the bill.

ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 19 to Senate Bill 1232.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Shadid.

#### SENATOR SHADID:

I move to non-concur, Mr. Chairman, and refer it to a conference committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Shadid moves to non-concur in House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 19 to Senate Bill 1232. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Mr. Secretary, Committee Reports.

# SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Weaver, Chair of the Committee on Rules, reports that the following Legislative Measures have been assigned to committees: Referred to the Committee on Executive - the motion to concur with House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1346; to the Judiciary Committee - motions to concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 33, House Amendments 1, 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 1285; to the Committee on State Government Operations and Executive Appointments - motions to concur with House Amendments

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

1, 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1182, (House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1570); and Be Approved for Consideration Conference Committee Report No. 1 on House Bill 1915. (Bill in parentheses submitted in writing, but not read into record)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Mr. Secretary, Messages from the House. SECRETARY HARRY:

Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 1694, with House Amendments 2, 4 and 6. Passed the House, as amended, June 14, 1994.

A Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to concur with the Senate in the adoption of their amendment to a bill of the following title, to wit:

House Bill 3197, with Senate Amendment No. 1.

We have like Messages on House Bill 3518, with Senate Amendment 1; House Bill 3779, with Senate Amendment 1; and House Bill 3975, with Senate Amendment 1.

All non-concurred in by the House on June 14, 1994.

A Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 167.

(Secretary reads HJR No. 167)

Adopted by the House, June 15, 1994.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd move for the suspension of the rules for the immediate consideration and adoption of House Joint Resolution 167.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Senator Weaver moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of immediate consideration and adoption of House Joint Resolution 167. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the rules are suspended. Senator Weaver, to explain the resolution. Senator Weaver has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 167. Those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Senator Weaver. SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would just remind the Membership to get their motions filed. It would help expedite getting them out of Rules and back to committee. So if you have something coming over from the House, get your motions filed so that we can act on them.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Mr. Secretary, Resolutions.

SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolutions 1618 through 1621, all offered by Senator Topinka.

Senate Resolution 1622, by Senator Mahar.

And Senate Resolution 1623, by Senator Woodyard.

Also, Senate Resolution 1624, offered by Senator Demuzio.

They're all congratulatory, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Consent Calendar. We will now proceed to the Order of Resolutions Consent Calendar. With leave of the Body, all those read in today will be added to the Consent Calendar. Mr.

133rd Legislative Day

June 15, 1994

Secretary, have there been any objections filed to the resolutions on the Consent Calendar?

# SECRETARY HARRY:

There have been no objections filed, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR WATSON)

Is there any discussion of the resolutions? Seeing none, the question is, shall the resolutions on the Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, No. The motion carries, and the resolutions are adopted. Is there any further business to come before the Senate? If not, pursuant to the adjournment resolution, the Senate will stand adjourned till next Tuesday at noon. Have a good weekend.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS

88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JUNE 15, 1994

94/11/04 11:01:13

SB-0230 SB-0357 SB-0630 SB-1172 SB-1191 SB-1200 SB-1232 SB-1267 SB-1267 SB-1302 SB-1324 SB-1357 SB-1448 SB-1558 SB-1558 SB-1558 SB-1766 SR-1394 SR-1486 SR-1394 SR-1470 SR-1486 SR-1560 SR-1621 SR-1622 SR-1622 SR-1624 HJR-0086	ADOPTED ADOPTED ADOPTED ADOPTED RESOLUTION OI ADOPTED	NCE NCE NCE NCE NCE NCE  PFERED PFERED PFERED PFERED PFERED PFERED PFERED PFERED PFERED	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	17287398012256890132346645678000000000000000000000000000000000000
SB-1691	CONCURRENCE			63
			PAGE	
				64
		NCE		
SR-1282	ADOPTED			
SR-1022	RESOLUTION OF	EEEBED EEEBED		
		I I LINDS		
HJR-0096			PAGE	10
HJR-0100			PAGE	11
HJR-0124			PAGE	11
HJR-0154			PAGE	12
HJR-0167	ADOPTED		PAGE	70
	RESOLUTION OF	FFERED	PAGE	69
SJR-0143			PAGE	13
SJR-0155		4.**	PAGE	37
SJR-0155	RESOLUTION F	AILED	PAGE	22
	SUBJECT MATT	ER		
ORDER-PRES	SIDENT PHILIP		PAGE	1
	DAVID SCHAUE	R	PAGE	1
POSTPONED			PAGE	1

SENATE TO ORDER-PRESIDENT PHILIP	PAGE	1
PRAYER-THE REVEREND DAVID SCHAUER	PAGE	1
JOURNALS-POSTPONED	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	68
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	69
RESOLUTIONS CONSENT CALENDAR-ADOPTED	PAGE	70
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	71